



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

SH

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/043,649	01/10/2002	Helen Mancebo	A-70219-1/RMS/DHR	6039
20350	7590	07/28/2004	EXAMINER	
TOWNSEND AND TOWNSEND AND CREW, LLP TWO EMBARCADERO CENTER EIGHTH FLOOR SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-3834				DIBRINO, MARIANNE NMN
		ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER
		1644		

DATE MAILED: 07/28/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<i>Office Action Summary</i>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/043,649	MANCEBO ET AL.
Examiner	Art Unit	
DiBrino Marianne	1644	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 November 2002.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) 1-16 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Applicant's amendment filed 11/13/04 is acknowledged and has been entered.
2. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. § 121:
 - I. Claims 1-3 and 5, drawn to a SLIM nucleic acid encoding a SLIM protein that is able to bind Cb1, classified in Class 536, subclass 23.5.
 - II. Claims 4 and 5, drawn to a SLIM nucleic acid encoding a SLIM protein that is not able to bind Cb1, classified in Class 536, subclass 23.1.
 - III. Claims 6 and 7, drawn to a SLIM protein that will bind to Cb1, classified in Class 530, subclass 350.
 - IV. Claim 8, drawn to a SLIM protein that will not bind to Cb1, classified in Class 530, subclass 395.
 - V. Claim 9, drawn to a method for screening for a bioactive agent capable of binding to SLIM comprising contacting SLIM protein and a candidate agent and determining binding, classified in Class 435, subclass 7.1.
 - VI. Claim 10, drawn to a method for screening for a bioactive agent capable of modulating SLIM binding comprising combining a SLIM protein, a candidate agent and Cb1 and determining binding of SLM to C1b in the absence and presence of the said agent, classified in Class 435, subclass 7.93.
 - VII. Claims 11-15, drawn to a method for screening for a bioactive agent capable of modulating lymphocyte activation, classified in Class 435, subclass 377.
 - VIII. Claim 16, drawn to a method for screening for a bioactive agent capable of modulating the ubiquitination of a Cb1 target, classified in Class 514, subclass 7.8.

3. Inventions III and V are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (M.P.E.P. § 806.05(h)).

In the instant case, the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process such as immunopurification procedures or as an immunogen for the production of antibodies.

4. Inventions IV and V are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (M.P.E.P. § 806.05(h)).

In the instant case, the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process such as immunopurification procedures or as an immunogen for the production of antibodies.

5. Inventions III and VI are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (M.P.E.P. § 806.05(h)).

In the instant case, the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process such as immunopurification procedures or as an immunogen for the production of antibodies.

6. Inventions III and VIII are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (M.P.E.P. § 806.05(h)).

In the instant case, the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process such as immunopurification procedures or as an immunogen for the production of antibodies.

7. Inventions V, VI, VII and VIII are different methods of use.

These inventions require different ingredients and process steps to accomplish the use of screening for a bioactive agent capable of binding to SLIM protein, capable of modulating SLIM binding, capable of modulating lymphocyte activation, or capable of modulating ubiquitination of a Cb1 target, respectively. For example, the method of invention V uses SLIM protein and determines binding of a candidate agent, whereas the method of invention VI uses SLIM protein and determines binding of SLIM protein to Cb1 in the absence of a candidate agent, whereas the method of invention VII uses SLIM protein and determines activation of a lymphocyte comprising a recombinant nucleic acid encoding a SLIM protein by a candidate agent, whereas the method of invention VIII uses SLIM protein, Cb1 ubiquitin or polyubiquitin and a Cb1 target protein to screen for an agent capable of modulating ubiquitination of a Cb1 target protein.

8. Inventions I, II, III and IV are different products.

Nucleic acids and proteins are distinct because their structures and modes of action are different, which require non-coextensive searches. In addition, the nucleic acid of invention I is different from the nucleic acid of invention II because the first encodes a protein (of invention III) that mediates the function of binding to Cb1, whereas the second encodes a protein (of invention IV) that does not, and the difference is indicative of structural distinction between the two nucleic acid molecules and the protein molecules as well.

Therefore they are patentably distinct.

9. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and the search required for any group from Groups I-VIII is not required for any other group from Groups I-VIII and Groups I-VIII have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification and divergent subject matter, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

10. The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and a product claim is subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be rejoined in accordance with the provisions of MPEP § 821.04. **Process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the patentable product** will be entered as a matter of right if the amendment is presented prior to final rejection or allowance, whichever is earlier. Amendments submitted after final rejection are governed by 37 CFR 1.116; amendments submitted after allowance are governed by 37 CFR 1.312.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103, and 112. Until an elected product claim is found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowed product claim will not be rejoined. See “Guidance on Treatment of Product and Process Claims in light of *In re Ochiai*, *In re Brouwer* and 35 U.S.C. § 103(b),” 1184 O.G. 86 (March 26, 1996). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, Applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution either to maintain dependency on the product claims or to otherwise include the limitations of the product claims. **Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder.** Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

11. This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species of the claimed Invention VII: wherein the determination of activation of a lymphocyte comprises:

- A) determining the activity of a nuclear factor in activated T cells (NFAT) responsive promoter, or
- B) determining the expression of CD69

These species are distinct because their structures and modes of action are different.

12. Applicant is advised that a response to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 C.F.R. § 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. M.P.E.P. § 809.02(a).

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103 of the other invention.

13. Applicant is advised that the response to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed.

14. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a diligently-filed petition under 37 C.F.R. § 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17(h).

15. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to Marianne DiBrino whose telephone number is 571-272-0842. The Examiner can normally be reached on Monday, Wednesday and Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Chan Y Christina, can be reached on 571-272-0841. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Marianne D

Marianne DiBrino, Ph.D.
Patent Examiner
Group 1640
Technology Center 1600
July 23, 2004

Christina Chan
CHRISTINA CHAN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600